

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

IN RE: YASMIN AND YAZ) 3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF
(DROSPIRENONE) MARKETING, SALES)
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY) MDL No. 2100
LITIGATION)

This Document Relates to:

Angie Ancheta, et al. v. No. 3:10-cv-13246-DRH-PMF
*Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.*¹

Shontay Ackerson v. No. 3:11-cv-10283-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Andrea Baginski v. No. 3:11-cv-12367-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Ashley Baker v. No. 3:10-cv-13883-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Callie M. Ball v. No. 3:10-cv-13875-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Megan Rae Berg v. No. 3:11-cv-11388-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Crystal Boroff v. No. 3:10-cv-13880-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Danielle Calabrese v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:10-cv-13371-DRH-PMF

Denise Cudney v. No. 3:11-cv-10617-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Katie Donaldson v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:11-cv-10486-DRH-PMF

Rochelle Dougherty v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:10-cv-11502-DRH-PMF

Kaci Douglass v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:11-cv-10487-DRH-PMF

¹ This motion applies to all plaintiffs, i.e., Angie Anchetta and Mable Hughes.

<i>Heather Gibson v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10654-DRH-PMF
<i>Kirsten Goodlett v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10610-DRH-PMF
<i>Ashley Handy v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10036-DRH-PMF
<i>Tiffany Hansley v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-13195-DRH-PMF
<i>Kiona Harvey v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-13330-DRH-PMF
<i>Donna and Robert Hill, Jr. v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-13596-DRH-PMF
<i>Ryann Hofmann v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10299-DRH-PMF
<i>Tammy Holmes v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10515-DRH-PMF
<i>Kathy Hutchinson v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10540-DRH-PMF
<i>Mireya and Jeff Iannuzzi v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11100-DRH-PMF
<i>Kassandra Keeling v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10044-DRH-PMF
<i>Geneva Kenner v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10208-DRH-PMF
<i>Michelle Kielman v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-13795-DRH-PMF
<i>Kara Kozaklewicz v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11481-DRH-PMF
<i>Carley Lockhart v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10609-DRH-PMF
<i>Melanie Lonczak v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-12753-DRH-PMF
<i>Angela Lorinchak v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10972-DRH-PMF

<i>Kristen Mangino v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-13358-DRH-PMF
<i>Danielle Mazur v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10255-DRH-PMF
<i>Jessica McCaslin v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10621-DRH-PMF
<i>Ashley Moore v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10023-DRH-PMF
<i>Sarah Moseley v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10454-DRH-PMF
<i>Tiffany Moses v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10536-DRH-PMF
<i>Clarissa Munoz v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10519-DRH-PMF
<i>Maggie C. Murdock v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11867-DRH-PMF
<i>Cynthia New v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10485-DRH-PMF
<i>Lauren M. Nolasco v. Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11928-DRH-PMF
<i>Kathleen Nold v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-12795-DRH-PMF
<i>Monica Ortiz v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10418-DRH-PMF
<i>Vanessa Palomo v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10065-DRH-PMF
<i>Jessica Rios v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11008-DRH-PMF
<i>Joanne Roberts v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:10-cv-12965-DRH-PMF
<i>Marsha Rucker v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-10270-DRH-PMF
<i>Mandy Schaible v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-12793-DRH-PMF
<i>Raven L. Smith v. Bayer Corp., et al.</i>	No. 3:11-cv-11637-DRH-PMF

Ursula Smith v. No. 3:10-cv-13400-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Kyrsen Unger v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:11-cv-10210-DRH-PMF

Rachel Warner v. No. 3:10-cv-13879-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Melissa Watson v. No. 3:10-cv-13193-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Michelle Whiting v. No. 3:11-cv-10286-DRH-PMF
Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.

Heather Young v. Bayer Corp., et al. No. 3:11-cv-10672-DRH-PMF

ORDER DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE

HERNDON, Chief Judge:

This matter is before the Court on the defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s motion, pursuant to Case Management Order 12 ("CMO 12"), for an order dismissing the plaintiffs' claims, in the above-captioned matters, with prejudice for failure to comply with Plaintiff Fact Sheet ("PFS") obligations.

On March 13, 2012, Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. moved to dismiss the above captioned matters without prejudice for failure to comply with PFS obligations. The Court granted the motion on May 31, 2012.

In the order dismissing the above captioned actions, the Court warned the plaintiffs that, "**pursuant to CMO 12 Section E, unless plaintiffs serve defendants with a COMPLETED PFS or move to vacate the dismissal without**

prejudice within 60 days after entry of this Order, the Order will be converted to a Dismissal With Prejudice upon defendants' motion."

On March 28, 2013, approximately ten months after the entry of the order of dismissal without prejudice, Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals Inc. filed the subject motion stating the plaintiffs are still not in compliance with their PFS obligations and asking the Court to convert the dismissals to dismissals with prejudice pursuant to Section E of CMO 12,

To date, none of the above captioned plaintiffs have taken any steps to cure their PFS deficiencies, to address the without prejudice dismissal, or to reply to the motion for dismissal with prejudice. The plaintiffs have had ample time to cure the any PFS deficiencies and avoid a with prejudice dismissal.

Having considered the motion and the relevant provisions of CMO 12 the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

The plaintiffs in the above captioned actions have failed to comply with their obligations pursuant to CMO 12 and more than 60 days have passed since the entry of the order of dismissal without prejudice for failure to comply with

CMO 12. Accordingly, pursuant to Section E of CMO 12, **the plaintiffs' complaints are hereby dismissed WITH prejudice.**

Further, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of the Court to enter judgment reflecting the same.

SO ORDERED:


David R. Herndon
2013.06.18
13:17:43 -05'00'

Chief Judge
United States District Court

Date: June 18, 2013